

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

SWF Krantechnik GmbH v. YOO BYEONGRYONG

Case No. D2026-3156

1. The Parties

The Complainant is SWF Krantechnik GmbH, Germany, represented by Roschier Brands, Attorneys Ltd., Finland.

The Respondent is YOO BYEONGRYONG, Republic of Korea.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <swfkrantechnik.com> is registered with INWX GmbH & Co. KG (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on July 17, 2026. On July 17, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On July 20, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (DomainPrivacyProtect.info) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on July 22, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on July 23, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on July 24, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was August 13, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on August 14, 2026.

The Center appointed Juan Lapenne as the sole panelist in this matter on August 18, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a company organized and existing under the laws of Germany and has been in business since 1921. The Complainant manufactures hoists and cranes, their parts and components as well as related electronical devices. It also provides related consultancy and training services.

The Complainant is the owner of the following trademarks:

European Union trademark registration No. 006807275 for SWF KRANTECHNIK, registered on November 26, 2008 in International Classes 7 and 9.

European Union trademark registration No. 018062668 for SWF KRANTECHNIK, registered on October 24, 2019 in International Classes 7, 9 and 37.

European Union trademark registration No. 012844775 for SWF, registered on September 30, 2014, in International Classes 7, 9 and 37.

The Complainant's primary domain name is <swfkrantechnik.com>, through which the Complainant promotes its products and services.

The disputed domain name does not point to any active website. The disputed domain name was created on April 10, 2026.

According to the Complainant, a phishing email was sent from an email address corresponding to the disputed domain name. The record contains documentary evidence supporting this allegation. The Respondent has not contested the alleged phishing activity.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark SWF KRANTECHNIK. The only difference between the disputed domain name and the Complainant's trademark SWF KRANTECHNIK lies in the last three letters (swfkrantechink v.s. SWF KRANTECHNIK), which is easily overlooked.

The Complainant submits that SWF KRANTECHNIK is inherently distinctive since "SWF" has no relation to the goods and services that it offers and that the Complainant's trademark has obtained a high degree of reputation in the lifting business industry.

With reference to rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name, the Complainant contends that the Respondent is not affiliated with the Complainant, and has never been licensed, authorized or permitted by the Complainant to use the trademark SWF KRANTECHNIK.

The Complainant highlights that to the best of its knowledge, the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name. The Respondent had no trademark, service mark or company name anywhere in the world at the time of applying for the registration of the disputed domain name.

The Complainant submits that there is enough evidence to confirm the Respondent has registered and used the disputed domain name in bad faith, due to the following: phishing attempt involving the disputed domain name <swfkrantechink.com>; the disputed domain name is clearly a typosquatted version of the Complainant's trademark SWF KRANTECHNIK; the degree of distinctiveness of the Complainant's trademark and the Respondent's act of concealing its identity.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 15 (a) of the Rules: "A Panel shall decide a complaint on the basis of the statements and documents submitted in accordance with the Policy, these Rules and any rules and principles of law that it deems applicable". Paragraph 4 (a) of the Policy directs that the Complainant must prove each of the following:

- (i) that the disputed domain name registered by the respondent is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) that the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name;
- (iii) that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established rights over the trademark SWF KRANTECHNIK based on the trademark registrations cited under section 4 above.

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Panel finds that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark SWF KRANTECHNIK, as the only difference lies in the latter three letters ("ink" v.s. "nik").

A domain name which consists of a variation of a trademark (typically a common, obvious, or intentional misspelling, referred to as typosquatting) is considered by panels to be confusingly similar to the relevant mark for purposes of the first element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.9.

The applicable Top-Level Domain (TLD) in a domain name is viewed as a standard registration requirement and as such is disregarded under the first element of the confusing similarity test. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to a trademark in which the Complainant has established rights according to paragraph 4 (a)(i) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of “proving a negative”, requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

In the instant case, the Panel notes that the Complainant has no relation with the Respondent and that the Complainant did not authorize the Respondent to incorporate a misspelled version of its trademark in the disputed domain name. The Respondent is not the Complainant’s licensee or otherwise affiliated to the Complainant.

There is no evidence to suggest that the Respondent is commonly known by the disputed domain name pursuant to paragraph 4(c)(ii) of the Policy.

Regarding the phishing attempt, panels have categorically held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity (e.g. the sale of counterfeit goods or (unlicensed) pharmaceuticals, phishing/identity theft, distributing malware, unauthorized account access/hacking, copycat sites, passing off, or other types of fraud) can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has proven that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name according to paragraph 4(a)(ii) of the Policy.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

Paragraph 4 (a)(iii) of the Policy requires that the Complainant proves that the disputed domain name was registered and used by the Respondent in bad faith.

Paragraph 4(b) of the Policy sets out a list of non-exhaustive circumstances that may indicate that a domain name was registered and used in bad faith, but other circumstances may be relevant in assessing whether a respondent’s registration and use of a domain name is in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

As to the bad faith registration at the time of registration of the disputed domain name, namely April 10, 2026, the Panel finds that the Complainant’s trademark SWF KRANTECHNIK is distinctive in the lifting industry and it was registered many years before the registration of the disputed domain name. Moreover, the disputed domain name is clearly a typo of the Complainant’s trademark.

Particular circumstances panels may take into account in assessing whether the respondent's registration of a domain name is in bad faith include: (i) the nature of the domain name (e.g., a typo of a widely-known mark), (vi) a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with no credible explanation for the respondent's choice of the domain name. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

Regarding bad faith use, on record there is evidence from the Complainant (which was not rebutted by the Respondent) about a phishing email attempt involving the disputed domain name. Specifically, the Respondent hijacked an existing email thread and impersonated the Complainant to send fraudulent invoices with altered payment instructions.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for purposes other than to host a website may constitute bad faith. Such active ("behind the scenes") uses are considered distinct from the passive holding doctrine discussed above, and can include a range of bad faith activity or scams such as sending email, phishing, identity theft. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4.

Therefore, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <swfkrantechink.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Juan Lapenne/

Juan Lapenne

Sole Panelist

Date: August 28, 2026